

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

20 April 1964

MEMORANDUM FOR: Director of Personnel

SUBJECT : Junior Professional Trainees

25X1A9A

1. It would be extremely helpful to know why [] has made the recommendations in the attached paper. It is always difficult to comment on proposals when you don't know their purpose. Nevertheless, I will take a crack at the ones he has made.

2. Certainly DD/S should move quickly to resolve open questions of requirements, qualifications, training, etc. for the expanded JOT Program. Also, [] must be dusted off and, if nothing else, get a fresh date. With respect to [] two main recommendations, however, I am not favorably inclined.

3. As for the first main recommendation -- transferring the JOT Program to Personnel -- I have no doubt this could be made to work. However, it seems to me that the proponent of any such change has the burden of proof that it is a profitable change. [] hasn't sustained this burden; he hasn't even offered an argument. Such a move, no matter how smoothly handled, involves a certain amount of dislocation, loss of momentum, and perhaps also some bruised feelings. [] has pointed out no compensating gains to offset these losses.

4. It seems to me there are three key ingredients in the JOT Program:

- a. the selection criteria and standards used in picking JOT's,
- b. the depth and breadth of their training, and,
- c. the careful guidance and handling they receive during the critical early phase of their Agency careers when their first impressions are being formed.

I don't question that, if given the JOT Program, Personnel will discharge its new responsibilities with credit. Surely, Personnel has a major stake in selection criteria and standards -- a stake it has not always upheld vigorously in the past. You know my strong feelings, however, that selection ought to be a partnership venture, not one dominated by a single component and certainly not by a single individual. I think that in the venture Personnel should have the laboring oar, Training and the Medics advisory roles, and the Career Service to which the candidate will eventually go the decisive vote. I believe this kind of partnership could be worked out just as easily whether the JOT Program is in OTR or the Office of Personnel. Similarly, JOT training shouldn't be affected by the organizational location of the responsibility for the Program. On the third item, however, -- the care and feeding of new JOT's -- I honestly would tip the scale in favor of OTR, primarily because training is such a crucial part of this initial care and feeding.

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

GROUP 1
Excluded from automatic
downgrading and
declassification

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

SUBJECT: Junior Professional Trainees

Moreover, I think the environment in OTR, inherently, is more favorable for the kind of fraternal atmosphere and parental handling that are so important during the early stages when a JOT is forming his attitude toward CIA and developing his career intentions. This is not to say that the job couldn't be done in Personnel; it is simply to voice the opinion that it can be done better in OTR.

25X1A9A

5. With respect to the second main recommendation [] makes -- a policy to recruit large numbers of JOT's from within CIA -- I am also disinclined, possibly because I don't get the full import of what he would have us do. Perhaps, too, because I detect in this recommendation the seed of real trouble. As you know, I want the JOT Program to be the mechanism for introducing into CIA almost all of its junior professionals who become career members. I want it to be the mechanism because it greatly increases our ability to apply consistently those selection standards which ensure the right qualifications among our professional careerists. And it gets them off to a fast start by providing a solid foundation of training and early guidance.

25X1A9A

6. The seed of trouble I see in [] second recommendation is the possibility of a return to the early concepts which underlay the JOT Program and which I oppose. If we accept the idea that most JOT's should be selected after a year or two in the Agency, we are quite likely to see the Program evolve into one for a limited number of "executive trainees." No longer would JOT standards be applied in the initial hiring of junior professionals; we would simply go back to our ancient practice of letting components pick their own by whatever precepts they see fit. Then, we would try to winnow out from the young professionals those with potential for executive development and crown them "JOT's." Perhaps in this I am hoisting up a "bogey man" but I suspect this may be the underlying intention of some who espouse the view that most JOT's should have a year or two of experience in the Agency before going into the Program.

7. I don't pretend to know a lot about executive development but I have read a good deal of the literature on the subject. And I am unaware of a single authority who believes he knows how to select in their early or mid-twenties the senior executives of the future. Moreover, a good many of the authorities (with whom I agree) think a great deal of harm can be done in an organization that tries to identify its senior executives at too early a stage. For this reason, I staunchly oppose any attempt to re-make the JOT Program into an executive trainee program.

8. I seriously wonder also, whether by requiring young professionals to work a year or two before applying for the JOT Program, we would shortchange them during their introduction to the Agency. Under present JOT concepts, new professionals get a good foundation of orientation and training before beginning their jobs. If we reverse the procedure, might we not put them and the Agency at a disadvantage? Unless, of course, we intend to provide some foundation training for all new professionals; and if we do that, what is the purpose of a JOT Program? To aid individuals to switch careers, as the original "internal" JOT Program operated? These are questions which I think need considerable exploration and discussion before anyone tries to form a final judgment.

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

SUBJECT: Junior Professional Trainees

9. One of the great difficulties I have always had in trying to "debate" the JOT Program is the problem of divining the true concepts and purposes behind ideas being expressed and proposals being made. This is a subject almost everybody is willing to discuss ad nauseam but few are willing to discuss in conceptual terms. Just what is [] trying to achieve? [] Or Matt Baird? Or anybody else? Only by knowing their real intent, and the philosophies which underlie their ideas and proposals, can we really discuss their ideas productively. There is more "shadow boxing" on this particular subject than perhaps any other I have discussed in the Agency through the years. 25X1A9A 25X1A9A

10. The JOT Program had a solid conceptual basis when General Smith launched it in 1951. He knew exactly what he had in mind and so did everyone else whether they agreed with him or not (quite a few didn't, of course; I am one). He wanted an executive training program designed to bring into the Agency each year a very limited number (40-50) of gifted young men and women to be developed for positions of senior responsibility. In 1956 or thereabout, this concept was changed. The program was to be expanded to provide highly qualified junior professionals to meet a great many personnel needs throughout the Agency. And in 1958 or 1959 25X1A9A directorate quotas were set totaling 125 or 130 a year. Somehow, however, the output from the Program never matched this expanded ambition. I have always sus-

It was at this stage in the life of the Program, so far as I can determine, that its conceptual base got "fuzzed" up; but, significantly, the Agency's top management failed to step in and chart the course clearly for all to follow. On this latter point, I have always been much more impressed by what the Program cranks out than by what its charter calls for. During the last 5 or 6 years when the Program was supposed to yield 125 or 130 JOT's annually to meet needs throughout the Agency, it consistently fell far below these figures and existed pretty much as a device to supply the case officer needs of the DD/P. Yet no remedial action occurred. Re-writing policy statements and all that sort of thing accomplish very little unless we are interested enough and determined enough to really chart the Program's course and see to it that the Program keeps on course.

11. I believe we are at a point in the history of the JOT Program where we are about to make a fundamental change in its actual accomplishments. We are about to alter its course so that it will become the mechanism for introducing into the Agency most of our junior professionals. If we begin tampering with what we have just wrought in the way of policy changes, we run the risk that our tampering will get out of hand. Everyone is entitled to his own view about the JOT Program and entitled to be heard if he wishes. But I don't think we should allow people to mask their intentions or conceal them when they speak (or write) so that what they are really trying to do never gets flushed out into the open. Debating the future course of the JOT Program is a healthy process. I am all for it. But, for goodness sakes, let's insist that those who wish to enter the debating arena do so with their full colors flying! Let's not have beguiling proposals which appear to accomplish

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

SUBJECT: Junior Professional Trainees

certain purposes but which are actually intended to, and will in time, accomplish quite different purposes.


12. It is particularly hard to comment adequately on various aspects of the JOT Program without injecting personalities. But even if this is one of the hazards, I think it would be advisable to invite into one forum the proponents of the various views that count with respect to the JOT Program and let them have it. I certainly would welcome such an opportunity and can assure you that none of my own views would either be masked or concealed.



25X1A9A

Chief, Plans and Review Staff
Office of Personnel

Attachment:

Draft by 
on "Junior Professional Trainees"
dtd 1 Apr 64

25X1A9A

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~